

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3. In Figure 3, previously omitted reference numeral 305 has been added to an element that was previously erroneously associated with reference numeral 307.

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 17, 20-21, 27-28, 38 and 44-48 have been amended. The claim amendments should in no way be construed to be acquiescence to any rejection based on alleged prior art. The amendments to the claims are made solely to expedite the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, none of the claim amendments are related to patentability, and do not narrow the claims as originally presented. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or subsequent patent applications.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to. As can be seen in the replacement sheet included herewith, Fig. 3 has been corrected according to the Examiner's requirement. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Claim Objections

The claims have been corrected according to the Examiner's requirement. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Rejection of Claims 45-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 45-48 have been amended. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 27 has been amended. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 1-14, 16-34 and 36-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being
Anticipated By Lewis**

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering the received message objects in the event source platform with a mobile agent object executing therein to determine a filtered set of message objects.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 4 and paragraphs 38-41, mobile agent objects work together to filter and collect messages at event source platforms 220 and 230 which meet a particular requirement of a user. The requirements are encoded as the event triggers and message properties contained within the mobile agent objects from configuration. Once determined to be relevant, *e.g.*, filtered, messages are sent to a collection host platform 210 and stored in a message database 211 for later retrieval by a redirection method described elsewhere in the specification.

As discussed in paragraph 5 of the specification, U.S. Pat. No. 6,016,393 to White et al., entitled, "System and Method for Distributed Computation Based upon the Movement, Execution, and Interaction of Processes in a Network", discloses a system that improves upon the concept of remote programming by utilizing processes called mobile agents (sometimes referred to as mobile objects or agent objects). The system described by White et al., provides the ability for an object (the mobile agent object), existing on a first ("host") computer system, to transplant itself to a second ("remote host") computer system while preserving its current execution state.

In contrast, Lewis fails in any manner to teach or suggest filtering received message objects in an event source platform with a mobile agent object executing therein. In fact, a thorough reading of Lewis reveals that Lewis fails to even discuss or otherwise mention mobile agent objects. The elements 24a-24d of Lewis that the Examiner seems to regard as mobile agent objects are actually

mobile data communication devices, which include computers, PDAs, telephones, *etc.* (See, for example, column 8, lines 31-41 of Lewis.) Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-28, 30-34, 36-44 and 46-48

Claims 2-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-28, 30-34, 36-44 and 46-48 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45.

**Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Lewis**

Claim 35 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 29.

**Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Lewis In View of Irlam**

Irlam fails to supply the teachings missing from Lewis, namely filtering received message objects in an event source platform with a mobile agent object executing therein. As such Lewis and Irlam, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office Action.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. G. Scott Born', written over a horizontal line.

P. G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491